

**HONORING THE SACRIFICE OF  
LIEUTENANT BRENDAN LOONEY  
AND LANCE CORPORAL TERRY  
HONEYCUTT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a sad occasion, but an appropriate occasion. I rise to pay tribute to two proud natives of Maryland who lost their lives in Afghanistan this fall, Navy Lieutenant Brendan Looney of Owings and Marine Lance Corporal Terry Honeycutt of Waldorf. I attended both of their burials at Arlington Cemetery. As I say, it was a mixture of deep sadness to lose these two young, extraordinarily capable, patriotic Americans, to be with their families, to learn what committed young men they were. At the same time, to be filled with pride that America has people like these two brave souls, willing to give their lives in the defense of freedom and justice and democracy and the safety and security of our people. I know that the grief their family feels is still fresh and that nothing can replace the loss they have suffered. But I want them to know the honor and awe in which we hold their sons' sacrifices.

Now it is our responsibility to keep their names, their memories, and their examples alive. Lieutenant Looney, a 29-year-old Navy SEAL, died with nine other American servicemembers in a helicopter crash in southern Afghanistan. Most of you read about that incident. He was a star lacrosse player at the Naval Academy and then chose to complete the grueling training required to become a Navy SEAL. Lieutenant Looney was recognized as the Honor Man, or top member of his SEAL class. And just 48 hours after marrying his wife, Amy, he deployed to Iraq. He served four deployments, four deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan and tragically died just 2 weeks before he was to return home from that fourth deployment. He is buried next to his Naval Academy roommate and best friend, First Lieutenant Travis Manion, who died in Iraq in 2007.

Lance Corporal Honeycutt, the other young man to whom I referred, died at the age of 19 in the blast of an improvised explosive device in Helmand province, Afghanistan. As long as his parents could remember, their son wanted to be a marine. He stood out for his commitment in his high school Junior ROTC program, and on graduating, he met his goal. Sadly, his life was cut far too short. But all those who remember Lance Corporal Honeycutt speak of a man who lived to serve his country and who embodied the marines' deepest ideals of service, sacrifice, and inner strength.

□ 1430

In the words of his mother Christine, whom I talked to Monday this week, "We have so much honor and pride and

joy, knowing that he was the person that he was, and I can't describe," she went on, "how proud we are of him. We knew him as the type of person that was ready, willing, and waiting to do anything for anybody."

He did that for his country, for all of us who serve in this Chamber, for every one of our fellow citizens.

These two irreplaceable lives are among the latest costs of a war that has lasted more than 9 years. This is not the time or place to speak about that war's future or its end.

But I ask my colleagues only this: We must remember that its costs are measured in lives like Brendan's and Terry's, and treat every debate and every decision about this war with a gravity that honors those two souls and the souls who have also been lost and who currently serve.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my deep sympathy for the families who have lost so much: To Lieutenant Looney's wife, Amy; to his parents, Kevin and Maureen; to his brothers, Billy and Steve; and to his sisters, Erin, Kellie and Briget; and to Lance Corporal Honeycutt's parents, Terry and Christine; his sister, Dawn; and to his sister's husband, who currently serves as a member of the United States Marines; and to all the grandparents, great-grandparents, aunts, and uncles whom we join in mourning the loss of these two brave, patriotic, extraordinary Americans. May God rest their souls and give strength and peace to their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey) addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

**THE "START" OF MORE  
OBSTRUCTION**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the 111th Congress has been an astounding success, but throughout the last 2 years, when we have failed to pass good laws, it's usually because our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol have stood in the way of our progress, proudly engaging in stubborn obstructionism.

The Senate is where good legislation goes to die. So I guess we shouldn't be surprised that it remains so right down to the final days of our session.

It appears now that there may not be enough Republican votes to ratify the New START Treaty, which would make huge strides towards reducing the threat of nuclear destruction.

This is distressing news, Mr. Speaker. After years of negligence on nuclear issues, the New START could finally put us on a course toward the eventual elimination of all nuclear weapons. It would drastically reduce the size of nuclear arsenals here in the United States and in Russia. It would improve our access to Russian nuclear facilities, which we've been unable to inspect since the expiration of the original START treaty nearly a year ago. And it would put our relationship with Russia on more solid footing, enhancing bilateral cooperation on a host of issues.

In the words of the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. KERRY, he said, and I quote him: "Ratifying New START is not a political choice; it's a national security imperative."

But apparently, Mr. Speaker, some over in the other Chamber aren't moved by national security imperatives. For them, 1,550 strategic warheads, the level mandated by New START, isn't a sufficient arsenal, even though 1,550 strategic warheads is enough to blow up the world several times over. The only way they know to deal with national security, it appears, is to send thousands of American troops to die in failed wars that carry a combined price tag of over \$1 trillion.

New START isn't perfect. I wish it were less incremental and more ambitious. I wish it embraced more of the principles contained in my resolution, which is called "Nonproliferation Options for Nuclear Understanding to Keep Everyone Safe," or "NO NUKES" for short. NO NUKES would move more aggressively toward complete nuclear global disarmament, which was exactly the long-term goal we committed to as a Nation when we signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty 40 years ago.

But New START is most definitely consistent with the SMART Security platform I laid out from this podium so many times, Mr. Speaker. Specifically, it advances the idea that we make the world safer, not through violence, not through acts of war and weapons escalation, but through diplomacy, cooperation, and conflict resolution.